

1 BRIAN M. BOYNTON  
2 Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General

3 SARAH S. WILSON  
4 Assistant Director

5 CHRISTINA P. GREER  
6 Senior Litigation Counsel

7 U.S. Department of Justice  
8 Civil Division  
9 Office of Immigration Litigation  
10 P.O. Box 878, Ben Franklin Station  
11 Washington, D.C. 20044  
12 Telephone: (202) 598-8770  
13 Christina.P.Greer@usdoj.gov

14 Attorneys for Defendants

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
17 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

18 Centro Legal de la Raza, *et al.*, ) CASE NO. 3:21-cv-00463-SI  
19 Plaintiffs, )  
v. ) JOINT STATUS REPORT AND [PROPOSED]  
Executive Office for Immigration ) ORDER  
Review, *et al.*, )  
Defendants. )

---

20 **STATUS REPORT**

21 The parties by and through their undersigned counsel hereby notify the Court that the Rule at  
22 issue in this case, Appellate Procedures and Decisional Finality in Immigration Proceedings;  
23 Administrative Closure, 85 Fed. Reg. 81,588 (Dec. 16, 2020) (“the Rule”), remains under review by the  
24 Department of Justice (“Department”). The Department has represented to Plaintiffs that it has made  
25 progress in its review, as evidenced by the Rule’s inclusion in the Executive Branch’s Spring 2022  
26 Unified Agenda of Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions. *See*  
27 <https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/eAgendaViewRule?pubId=202204&RIN=1125-AB18>.

28 In the parties’ June 21, 2022, status report, the Department noted the Supreme Court’s recent

1 decision in *Garland v. Aleman Gonzalez*, 142 S. Ct. 2057 (2022), and the parties stated that they would  
 2 “provide the Court with their positions as to the applicability, if any, of the decision by or in their next  
 3 status report.” At this time the parties disagree as to the applicability of *Aleman Gonzalez* but agree that  
 4 the case should remain in abeyance to allow the regulatory process to proceed.

5 The Department believes that the Supreme Court’s interpretation of 8 U.S.C. § 1252(f)(1)  
 6 renders the Court’s preliminary injunction unlawful and likely also renders unlawful the Court’s stay of  
 7 the Rule’s effective date under 5 U.S.C. § 705 because both orders “enjoin or restrain” the Department  
 8 from implementing 8 U.S.C. §§ 1229a and 1229c through the Rule. *See Aleman Gonzalez*, 152 S. Ct. at  
 9 2064-65 (holding that section 1252(f)(1) prohibits lower courts from enjoining “the way that [a  
 10 provision is] being carried out” (internal quotation marks omitted)). However, *Aleman Gonzalez* only  
 11 directly addressed section 1252(f)(1)’s application to injunctive relief. The Supreme Court is currently  
 12 considering section 1252(f)(1)’s application to “set aside” relief under 5 U.S.C. § 706(2) in *United  
 13 States v. Texas*, No. 22-58 (U.S. cert. granted July 21, 2022), and the Department believes that a  
 14 decision on that issue may address the types of remedies and orders barred by section 1252(f)(1), which  
 15 would likely shed important light on the propriety of postponing an effective date under 5 U.S.C. § 705.  
 16 Accordingly, the Department believes that any briefing on the propriety of the Rule’s postponement  
 17 should wait until the Supreme Court’s decision. Given that the postponement of the effective date  
 18 independently bars the government from implementing the challenged Rule, the Department believes it  
 19 unnecessary and not in the interests of judicial economy to move to vacate the preliminary injunction at  
 20 this time. The Department thus believes that the proceedings should remain in abeyance with the  
 21 Court’s preliminary injunction and effective date postponement in place.

22 Plaintiffs disagree with the Department’s position on the applicability of 8 U.S.C. § 1252(f)(1)  
 23 but agree that the proceedings should remain in abeyance with the Court’s preliminary injunction and  
 24 effective date postponement in place. Plaintiffs believe it would be a waste of judicial resources for the  
 25 Court to consider the parties’ competing interpretations of *Garland v. Aleman Gonzalez*, 142 S. Ct. 2057  
 26 (2022), and 8 U.S.C. § 1252(f)(1) at this time because the Supreme Court will issue an order in *United  
 27 States v. Texas*, No. 22-58 (U.S. cert. granted July 21, 2022), that will almost certainly reshape the  
 28 parties’ positions. Furthermore, Plaintiffs anticipate that the Government will soon issue a new rule that

1 will inform the next stages of this litigation.

2 Given the parties' agreement that the proceedings should remain in abeyance to allow the  
3 regulatory process to proceed, the parties request that the Court continue the abeyance and propose  
4 submitting another joint status report in 90 days.

5

6 Respectfully submitted,

7 By: /s/ Naomi A. Igra  
Naomi A. Igra  
8 Litigation Counsel  
Sidley Austin LLP  
9 555 California Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Tel. (415) 772-7495  
10 Naomi.igra@sidley.com

By: /s/ Christina P. Greer  
CHRISTINA P. GREER  
Senior Litigation Counsel  
U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division  
P.O. Box 878, Ben Franklin Station  
Washington, DC 20044  
Tel. (202) 598-8770  
11 Christina.P.Greer@usdoj.gov

Counsel for Plaintiffs

Counsel for Defendants

12 Dated: October 31, 2022

13  
14  
15  
16 [PROPOSED] ORDER

17 The parties are ordered to submit a status report within 90 days of this order.

18  
19 DATED: October 31, 2022

Susan Illston  
HON. SUSAN ILLSTON  
United States District Judge